Introduction

Thank you for that kind introduction and warm reception. I'd like to welcome you all back to Washington, and to this esteemed institution, the National Defense University. It is a privilege for me to address such a distinguished group of professionals. With the time that I have, I would like to lend support to this renowned International Fellows Program, with a few thoughts that I offer for your consideration.

As an international community, the challenges that we face in the twenty-first century demand an appreciation for broad-ranging issues and the numerous areas of approach that necessarily will involve all our national instruments of power. It also will require close coordination with allies, friends, and partners, in a variety of institutional settings. What Karl Deutsch termed over forty years ago as "security communities,"[1] these interactions create a sense of mutual assurance and assistance. In the current environment, security communities facilitate a confidence-building approach toward facing problems together, and thus, toward solving them together.

The International Milieu

We now have the benefit of experience – especially in the last two decades, but even further beyond – to appreciate that political, economic, legal, social, and security issues are inextricably linked. Now more than ever, our efforts require holistic views and integrated methods. Economic globalism, political and social dynamism, technological innovations, and other important post-Cold War developments have created new rules in the global order. We now also have a greater appreciation for internal political and social movements, and we know that it behooves us to take more than mere homogenous views,

[1] Karl Deutsch, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

from the perspective of elites, of individual nations. Rather, the international landscape requires a coordinated approach in all areas: the economy encompasses more than just dollars and cents, and deficits and surpluses; political matters involve more than simply elections and governance, or international diplomacy; and, in our line of work, security involves much more than mere police actions or military considerations.

In fact, today's international security environment requires military leaders to be steeped in a broad variety of political-military and socio-economic disciplines, so as to possess an appreciation for the wider ramifications of military action. The reality is, in today's international security environment, we face much more than just interstate conflict. Threats now include a whole host of transnational issues: terrorism, insurgencies, ethnic conflict, natural disasters, poverty, disease, state failure, refugees, proliferation, the environment, and much more; and, each can have profound effects on the others. The recent international economic crisis reminds us of the need to be collectively vigilant in staving off any corresponding political crisis. The brave voices of ordinary citizens, calling for legitimate elections and effective governance, demonstrate how a political crisis could erupt into a security situation.

These and other scenarios remind us that "security" must involve those aspects of the daily lives of ordinary people, who have dreams and aspirations toward productive, purposeful, and gratifying lives – that notions of self-determination, justice, and opportunity are not trivial matters, but that indeed, they form the foundation of a safe and secure society, both domestically and internationally. These challenges continue to confound many of our twentieth century paradigms, and we may have to reconsider the sufficiency of any approach that is focused solely on sovereignty of nation-states, social and political systems, balances of power, and other macro-level considerations that are divorced from micro-level interactions. It is not just about elite classes; our attention must also be on their attitudes and actions vis-à-vis ordinary people. Thus, it is appropriate to evaluate the presidential elections in Afghanistan, but

it is also proper to focus on earning the support of the Afghan people, as General McChrystal correctly emphasizes, if we are to have any chance of succeeding there.

One other point that I would like to make is how small the world has become. Due to technologies that enable international travel nearly as commonplace as neighborhood jaunts, or that facilitate split-second communications across global distances, we no longer are limited by national boundaries or vast geographical expanses. The compelling feature of our world today is our global interconnectedness. It is true that, as a result, benefits abound. For example, global trade has increased aggregate productivity while lowering prices, and by and large has provided us with better quality goods and services and a higher standard of living. But, also resulting from globalization are diseases that spread more quickly; radical ideologues that mobilize other extremist actors more readily; and, failing states and ungoverned spaces that menace peace and security writ large, such that threats that otherwise might be isolated – out of sight and out of mind – in fact may be existential, even if half a world away. Thus, these and other issues require the attention of the international community.

Toward Twenty First Century Security

Indeed, the so-called "international community" that operates within this dynamic environment is critical. Insofar as responsible members of the community perceive themselves as accountable to the other members, it has a normative effect. Moreover, through international institutions, we have accepted structure in addition to behavioral norms. Chartered organizations such as the United Nations, informal groups such as the G-20, and a whole host of political arrangements such as the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, and other nonproliferation regimes, provide necessary material resources to enhance combined efforts. There is little dispute that the "international community" is central to addressing our collective challenges today, especially in the security realm. Our common values underpin our close security cooperation; and, in turn, our cooperation

and engagement become the fountainhead for further deepening of our shared values and strengthening of our transnational linkages.[2]

Therefore, international relationships – close and robust ones, like those that we share in this room – are a *sine qua non* of any international community, and certainly of any network of defense professionals; and, that is why we believe that our international relationships are so important. Through our interactions, we have positive socializing effects on each other, and form the normative element that is mutually complementary with the resources afforded by formal institutions.

Within this construct, our way forward must involve a holistic and comprehensive view. We cannot afford to regard nation-states – or even regions, for that matter – as simple atomistic actors. Rather, they are interrelated, multi-faceted, and driven by any number of motivations and internal circumstances. From a whole-of-government perspective, that is why, within the United States government, there is a constant emphasis on interagency coordination, to carefully balance so-called "hard" and "soft" elements of national power, where diplomatic, military, economic, informational, legal, and cultural elements are integrated, and our national approach is harmonized.

However, there is also an important element of intergovernmental cooperation between and among functional counterparts – interactions that are critical to the broader country-to-country relationships. In fact, these sorts of cooperative efforts occasionally are the backbone of the relationship, irrespective of the current politics. For example, robust military-to-military relationships address any number of transnational terrorism issues; associations of government health experts collectively respond to a flu pandemic, like the recent H1N1; and, intelligence officials provide mutual assistance in collecting, analyzing, and disseminating vital information, regardless of the particular direction of political winds.

---

[2] Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, *Security Communities* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

In the end, our efforts must take into account the aggregate of multiple national instruments – in other words, an individual nation's complement of hard and soft power elements, balanced and coordinated with those of partner nations. As Secretary Gates has stated, "The best solutions require multiple nations acting with uncommon unity."[3] To do this, we must continue our efforts to build new partnerships, and bolster existing ones, just as we are this evening. We must evaluate the numerous strengths of our partners, leverage those niche capabilities that will pay the greatest dividends, and integrate them with those of other partner nations. As we build the capacities of our partners to better defend themselves, and to support other international efforts, we will be better poised to discover the solutions to which Secretary Gates referred.

This approach will be critical, and we must be mindful of this as we move forward with addressing one of the greatest direct challenges to those of us operating in the realm of international security: suppressing transnational terrorism. It will take the full complement of national resources as I have outlined them, to reduce the conditions under which radicalism develops, and to counter its violent manifestations. From a military perspective, we are making progress in many vulnerable areas. Currently, the operation that is most highlighted is, of course, the one in Afghanistan. We still have a lot of heavy lifting to do there, from manning and securing Provincial Reconstruction Teams; to undertaking critical infrastructure projects; to training army and police forces; to educating Afghan farmers on more efficient methods and more sustainable crops, and promoting alternatives to poppy production and trade; to providing a wide variety of health care, education, and other civil services. For all of these efforts, we are grateful for the willingness of our international partners to undertake this truly global, truly team effort.

Conclusion

The United States, and certainly its Armed Forces, values its relationships with its friends, allies, and partners around the world. The sense of community that we all share necessarily relies on our common values and

[3] Robert M. Gates, speech to the International Institute for Strategic Studies, May 30, 2009.

similar culture, which, as noted scholar Charles Tilly writes, consist of "shared understandings and their representations."[4] Culture is an indispensible complement to mutual trust, partnership, cooperation, and responsiveness. These shared values unite the efforts of the international community, and focus them toward the realization of collective national interests. They also normalize our endeavors. As we operate in the global commons – in the air, in space, in cyberspace, or on the sea – we recognize the rule of law and other binding mechanisms that protect these domains, and ensure access to all responsible members of the international community.

One cannot exaggerate effective international engagements as a security imperative, as we meet formidable challenges, across a vast expanse of issues, requiring a wide variety of disciplines and expertise to achieve success. As we endeavor toward a more secure and harmonious world, we should always be boldly ambitious in our vision, to create not only a more stable global order, but also a steady and enduring global peace.

Thank you for allowing me to spend a few minutes sharing these thoughts with you tonight. I am humbled to be among individuals of such enormous stature, and I will always cherish the fellowship that we shared tonight, that which we shared in classrooms here, and the duties that we continue to perform together. On behalf of the American Armed Forces, we wish you the very best.

[4] Charles Tilly, "International Communities, Secure or Otherwise," *Security Communities*, edited by Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).